

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
AUGUST 3, 1998**

The Council work session came to order at 5:40 p.m. in the Public Safety Building Community Meeting Room.

Present were Mayor Tomei and Councilors Kappa, Lancaster, and Marshall; Planning Commissioners Cook, Hammang, and Miller; City Manager Bartlett; and Planning Director Heiser.

Also present: Chris Eaton and Jean D'Agostino, W&H Pacific; and Chris Deffenbach, Brenda Bernards and Jennifer Bradford, Metro.

South Willamette River Crossing Study

Chris Deffenbach, Metro Project Manager, updated the Council on the South Willamette River Crossing Study and provided some preliminary results. Under study was the ten-mile area between the Marquam and I-205 Bridges.

The problems identified were: transportation funding is not adequate for growth; demands exceed capacities; bicycle and pedestrian needs are not being met; Sellwood Bridge is nearing the end of its useful life; and policies conflict between jurisdictions. Estimates indicate that about 70% of the trips across the Sellwood Bridge end in Clackamas County.

Metro's role is to develop and recommend improvement and identifying financing plans. The project schedule calls for completing the technical analysis, travel forecasts, and cost estimates in order to develop feasible options for a fall recommendation to Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and the Metro Council.

There are three possible crossing options for which Metro has developed costs. These crossings are: Hwy. 43 to Hwy. 224; Hwy. 43 north of the railroad bridge to 99E via Courtney Road; and Hwy. 43 to 99E at Concord. Metro also looked at how demands could be met by improving the Ross Island Bridge or additional transit service.

Deffenbach reviewed the cost and forecast methods. The costs reflected: feasible alignments; 2- and 4-lane crossing comparisons; aesthetic properties; and infrastructure improvements. Travel forecasts reflected probable travel pattern changes and indicated demands rather than solutions.

She reviewed the Sellwood Bridge options. Maintaining it as it is today for 100 years would cost \$40 million. Rehabilitating it to current standards would cost \$72 million. Maintaining it for bike and pedestrian use only would cost \$23 million. A 2-lane replacement span would cost \$44 - \$60 million, and a 4-lane span would cost \$58 - \$74 million.

Councilor Marshall asked, for clarification, if the replacement cost of \$44 million included maintenance. **Deffenbach** said this cost assumes major requirements, not routine needs. The older bridges require more maintenance than the newer ones.

Councilor Kappa asked if the maintenance in this case referred to structural. **Deffenbach** said that was correct. Rehabilitation to today's standards would cost more than replacement.

Deffenbach said one of the major concerns was the probability of dramatic traffic volume increases if more travel lanes were added to the bridge. The forecast estimates a traffic volume increase of about 15%. The additional bridge width would reduce delays on the bridge itself and congestion on Hwy. 43. A four-lane bridge would not change the users and their travel patterns. The Study also found that there would be an economic impact if the Sellwood Bridge were used for only pedestrian and bike traffic.

The Clackamas County Crossings were Hwy. 43 to Hwy. 224; Hwy. 43 north of Lake Oswego to 99E via Courtney Road; and Hwy. 43 near Marylhurst to Hwy. 99E via Concord Road. A new crossing would shorten most trips, increase accessibility to some areas, reduce demands on other bridges, and support Clackamas County uses. Forecasts also indicated decreased usage the further south the new crossing was located.

The Milwaukie crossing option would reduce congestion on the Sellwood Bridge, and the Marylhurst crossing would reduce traffic on the I-205 bridge. The Lake Oswego options would take less traffic from the existing bridges but would create more new crossings.

The Clackamas crossings are significantly more expensive for both the two- and four-lane options because of the river size, topography, environmental sensitivity, and right-of-way costs. There would also be costs incurred improving existing facilities such as the connections to Hwy. 224 and Hwy. 43.

Councilor Kappa asked if Hwy. 224 would have to be widened. **Deffenbach** said Metro recognizes that need, but it was not pursued for costing purposes. There would be significant community character and circulation impacts. At some policy level, people have already realized the need for additional improvements based on 2015 projected demands. The crossing options would create displacements, disruptions, and noise and visual impacts.

The Ross Island Bridge options would help relieve west-end ramp bottlenecks and add capacity to the corridor. The relationship between the rest of the corridor and Ross Island Bridge usage is not that strong. This option would help remove regional traffic from the Corbett and Lair Hill neighborhoods and remove traffic from the downtown bridges, but it would have little effect on the Sellwood Bridge. A new Ross Island Bridge would cost about \$115 million to \$132 million in addition to development on either side.

The final area **Deffenbach** discussed was demand management/additional transit service. These would include new east/west bus routes, commuter rail service, transit fare reductions, new Transportation Management Associations (TMA), and Employee Commute Options (ECO) rule success. These efforts could increase ridership by 10% including trips across the river. Congestion would not be reduced significantly, and pedestrian and bicycle access would not be improved.

Deffenbach summarized the choices. Maintaining the Sellwood Bridge at two-lanes was the least disruptive, but it would not address pedestrian and bicycle access needs. Replacing the bridge may be somewhat more expensive, but that option would not meet traffic demands. The four-lane bridge would cost 20% - 30% more depending upon the aesthetic choices. This option would also address pedestrian and bicycle needs and traffic demands, but traffic in the neighborhoods would increase by about 15%.

The Milwaukie Crossing would be the most effective option for reducing Sellwood Bridge impacts. In addition to significant costs and community impacts, there would be infrastructure improvements not consistent with current policy with the exception of Hwy. 224. The benefit would be improved access to and within Clackamas County.

The Ross Island Bridge option would not reduce demand on the Sellwood Bridge or other bridges in the corridor. The addition of transit options would reduce trips but would not address bridge congestion or meet pedestrian and bicycle needs.

Councilor Kappa asked if there was a timeline for the decision, and he expressed significant concerns with the Hwy. 224 option.

Mayor Tomei asked for a more clear idea of where the Hwy. 224/Hwy. 43 crossing would be located and what the impact might be to the Milwaukie riverfront. **Deffenbach** said engineers are looking at how connections would be made and what the effects would be in the area.

Hammang asked what the source of impacts to Hwy. 224 would be.

Deffenbach said a lot of Hwy. 224 traffic currently goes to the Sellwood Bridge. The increase would be a result of those who would typically have stayed on the east side, but would travel to the west side if there were a viable crossing option.

Hammang asked if the Sellwood Bridge would require a seismic retrofit if it were to become a pedestrian and bicycle bridge. **Deffenbach** said staff assumed for cost estimate purposes that it would not.

Hammang asked if a new two-lane bridge would still be too small to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic. **Deffenbach** said two lanes would not meet the demand.

Councilor Kappa was concerned about pass through traffic in the neighborhoods. **Deffenbach** said demand can be forecasted, but there is another step in determining the acceptability of additional traffic. There is a range of measures that can be taken to avoid neighborhood impacts.

Deffenbach added that Multnomah County continues to maintain the Sellwood Bridge, but this has been a regional decision for some time. The County is not taking on any major maintenance needs, so a decision needs to be made relatively soon.

Councilor Kappa noted the Milwaukie crossing would be between Clackamas and Multnomah counties, so it would be a joint-jurisdictional bridge. **Deffenbach** said staff has not looked at the jurisdictional side of the issue.

Councilor Lancaster asked how long it would be from the time the decision was made to construction. **Deffenbach** estimated ten years.

Mayor Tomei felt it was ridiculous in a heavily populated area to have ten miles between bridges. She would rather see a new crossing rather than enlarging the Sellwood Bridge, but she was very concerned about potential impacts to the Milwaukie riverfront. **Deffenbach** said there could be some pedestrian and bicycle access benefits to the riverfront and employment area.

Board and Commission Interviews

The City Council interviewed Al Dorsey, Dennis Vanderpool, Howard Steward, and Judith Borden for board and commission vacancies.

Functional Plan Compliance Report

Chris Eaton, W&H Pacific, presented an update on the Metro Functional Plan Compliance Report.

The project is on schedule with a Planning Commission public hearing on August 11, 1998, and the City Council hearing on August 18. Any corrections or amendments will be made to the July 20 public review draft.

The Executive Summary portion of the Report is the key document that will likely be reviewed by the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MAPC). Major portions include the public process summary, sections with which Milwaukie complies, items completed to date, tasks not started, and requests for exceptions and amendments.

Report page ES-1 provided a summary table of information contained in Appendix A regarding Title 1 target capacities for dwelling units and jobs. Dwelling unit target capacity is 3,514, and the job target is 7,748. These tables indicated how the targets were adjusted and show Milwaukie is at 90% of dwelling unit target capacity and 53% for employment.

The rest of that section addressed Titles 2 and 6. It indicated that these were areas with which the City feels it is in compliance. She referred back to the Title 1 section that discussed Milwaukie's compliance with its partitioning standards, built density standards, and public facilities plan.

The next section summarized the items Milwaukie has completed to date. These included the Regional Center Master Plan (RCMP), the Transportation Systems Plan (TSP), Lake Road Multi-Modal Plan, and the recently adopted mixed use overlay zones for the downtown area and four designated key redevelopment sites.

There was also a list of twenty-one items with fifty-seven tasks the City would undertake to come into compliance with other sections of the Plan. The Report indicates the City will complete these tasks by February 19, 1999, unless otherwise stated. Most of these tasks would not be considered major policy issues.

Report page ES-5 contained the section in which the City told Metro those areas in which it did not comply and for which it would need exceptions or amendments. The first was a Growth Concept Map amendment that would change from a Regional Center design type to a Town Center. The two

exceptions were: (1) the 2017 adjusted jobs target of 4,176 new jobs to 2,218 new jobs by 2017 because of the lack of vacant, unconstrained, non-residential land within the City limits; and (2) the Table 2 standard for maximum of one parking space for new single-family development in favor of leaving this parking standard as it currently exists at two spaces.

The group discussed the City's current parking standard of providing two parking spaces for new single-family development. **Heiser** added one must be a covered parking space. The City requires three parking spaces for flag lots -- one covered and two not covered. The Planning Commission has experienced concern that there is limited street parking spaces in infill areas.

Miller said the City is trying to keep more cars from parking on the streets and is not increasing the parking capacity.

Hammang said the parking minimums accurately reflect current behavior. The recommendation was to keep things as they are. People will have cars, and parking on both sides of narrow streets would cause problems.

Councilor Kappa said that goes to the discussion of the flag lot issue.

Eaton said the City could require only one space, but the market could provide more.

Mayor Tomei said the market may dictate the number of off-street parking spaces, but she questioned why the City would require more than one. The goal seems to be to reduce people's dependency on the automobile.

Heiser said there was recently a four-lot subdivision that did not allow on-street parking. Both the Planning Commission and the neighbors were concerned about guest cars parking on that street or adjacent streets.

Councilor Kappa felt there was a consistent problem in the Subdivision Ordinance which has gone unaddressed. He suggested addressing the parking problem and street widths. He understood the City wanted to go forward with the "skinny street" concept.

Heiser noted that standard comes from the Transportation System Plan.

Miller said the problem is having either streets that would accommodate on-street parking or requiring sufficient off-street parking.

Councilor Kappa felt the Subdivision Ordinance should be reviewed so that people do not park on the streets and off-street parking be provided.

Hammang said consumer behavior for at least the next twenty-five years will be heavy dependence on the automobile. He felt the City's requirement was reasonable.

Councilor Kappa understood the goal was to provide a community that would offer more modes of travel, and he did not see that taking place. Requiring more parking spaces would perpetuate that atmosphere.

Mayor Tomei added it would preclude, if there were development close to transportation, anyone from having either one or no car. The parking spaces would still be required whether they were needed or not.

Eaton clarified the single-family parking standards were the same whether or not the residence was near high capacity transit.

Heiser added that developers have an opportunity to provide alternate parking plans for cluster developments.

Hammang did not feel anyone in the vicinity of high capacity transit would be burdened by this.

Eaton said the ordinance would have to be amended to recognize other qualifications.

Bernards commented on variance procedures for the minimum and maximum number of parking spaces.

Eaton added the City does have an existing variance process.

Heiser pointed out there was also an exception process that offered a mechanism for proving fewer spaces are needed.

Eaton suggesting amending the parking code to make an exception for certain areas near high capacity transit.

Councilor Marshall said the majority of development in Milwaukie was infill, and most existing neighborhood streets are already narrow. The City needs to make sure in these infill areas that off-street parking is provided to accommodate the existing neighborhood character of narrow streets.

Mayor Tomei agreed but felt there should be a mechanism for providing exceptions for development near transit.

Hammang suggested that, if all available land near high capacity transit were inventoried, most of it would probably already be zoned multi-family.

Eaton said, as she reads the City's code, this refers to single-family attached or detached, so duplexes could be included.

Mayor Tomei referred to Report page ES-7 regarding Table 2 requirements and asked for clarification.

Eaton said this was for new single-family development, and no more than one space will be required. She understood refining the exception could be done at the Planning Commission level. The exception could include fine-tuning parking standards for those areas on the parking map near high capacity transit. The City would still ask for an exception in the remaining areas.

Councilor Kappa said there are skinny streets in Portland, and homes have single car garages. He had concerns about the direction in which the City was going.

Eaton said the trade-off would be slower traffic.

Hammang said, typically some of the older areas have one-car garages, but there is parking space in the driveway for up to three vehicles. That would add capacity.

Heiser said the City is not seeing a lot of through streets; most development is taking place on cul-de-sacs.

Mayor Tomei said through streets would probably be developed in the future.

Hammang said, as the urban form evolves, the City's development code could be amended.

Councilor Kappa expressed concerns that there be connectivity, and discussed requiring larger developments to create a community.

Hammang added the City only has 34.3 acres minus park land for redevelopment. Through streets and larger developments would be dependent upon people selling their properties.

Eaton said she could add a statement to the exception that would translate into a task of developing a code amendment for applying Table 2 standards to some parts of the City.

Bernards felt this was a good approach, and there could be opportunities for providing only one parking space. Metro's ultimate goal is to make better use of the land.

Eaton said she met with Metro, and there were two points of concern. One had to do with the work being proposed for Title 1. She referred to Report page ES-4 and the analysis of mapping and planning for design types. The summary statement included mapping Main Streets, such as 32nd Avenue, and Station Communities. She intended to include Metro Executive Mike Burton's July 1, 1998, letter regarding densities in station areas. Metro has asked that the reference to future refinement plans not be dropped although the text goes on to state that Milwaukie does not intend to plan for those areas.

Hammang was concerned some might interpret the language to say that the City plans to densify in the future.

Bernards said under Title 1, Section 3, the City is required to map the design types.

Hammang was more comfortable standing on the strength of Burton's letter.

Eaton said the detailed discussion was on Report page 2-6, and the final version submitted to Metro will include both Resolution 22-1998 and Burton's letter.

Eaton agreed with another Metro statement regarding Report pages 2-28 and 3-5 that some amendments were required by February 1999.

Metro is pleased with Milwaukie's progress and the amount of time both the City Council and Planning Commission have put into the Report.

Councilor Marshall asked if the City needed to ask for an exception on the station areas.

The group agreed to let the Metro Council and MPAC look at this issue and recommend how the City should proceed.

Eaton referred to Appendix Table 1 and noted a change in the percentages from the previous discussion. Dwelling units was at 90% of target and employment at 53%.

D'Agostino discussed the applicable methodologies for job capacity. These credits applied to the target had to do with home-based jobs and employment absorption. The City Council directed staff to use Metro's methodology, and that was reported in the public review draft.

Eaton explained staff tried to tie the job absorption back to the land capacity and how more jobs could fit into an existing facility.

Bernards said Metro would see 2,200 jobs as the starting point and will be more concerned with the capacity than the amount of the exception.

Eaton added the percent of target was 37% and not 53% as staff estimated.

Bernards understood Milwaukie was saying the target capacity of 7,478 was not reasonable. The 2,200 jobs was the important information, and there may be a lot of redevelopment potential in the downtown area. It is not unreasonable for Milwaukie to ask for an exception, and it would be appropriate to point out the target is not realistic. It is more important to start with what Milwaukie can do.

D'Agostino had also prepared a table resulting in the 37% target.

The group agreed to submit the figures and acknowledge more work needed to be done. It was agreed the Planning Commission could review this issue and make a recommendation to the City Council before the Report was submitted.

Mayor Tomei referred to Report page 2-23 and the reference to Milwaukie's Riverfront Concept Plan and flood plains.

Eaton suggested language be included regarding riverfront amenities and Title 3 impacts. Staff proposed this be a work element in the next nine months.

Mayor Tomei referred to Report page 2-19 #2 – "delete multi-family reduction near transit" and asked for clarification.

Eaton said the current code has a reduction factor for development near transit. Once the Zone A map and minimum/maximum table is adopted, this would essentially be accomplished. This would eliminate one of two potentially conflicting references.

Riverfront Board and Request for Qualifications (RFQ)

Bartlett discussed the RFQ process that was underway with Jeff Tashman.

Mayor Tomei suggested the Board help the City Council review the RFQs and interview the consultants. **Councilor Marshall** agreed the Board should be involved as soon as possible.

The group discussed the redesigned newsletter and Grady Wheeler's role with the neighborhoods. His responsibility would be to assist the neighborhoods in meeting their deadlines and to edit articles as needed.

The group discussed the Riverfront Board recruitment and membership.

Councilor Marshall suggested a seven-person, at-large membership.

Councilor Kappa suggested membership be limited to residents. The group agreed to interview applicants at the August 17 work session.

The Board's minimum charge would be to work with the City Council and consultant on the Plan. The consultant could define the Board's role as the project evolved.

Other

1. **Mayor Tomei** announced National Night out events in Milwaukie.
2. **Councilor Lancaster** urged people to volunteer for the Teen Center.
3. **Bartlett** pointed out correspondence from the City Attorney regarding voting in work sessions.
4. **Councilor Kappa** felt it was important to address traffic safety issues and street improvement funding. **Bartlett** said Public Works Director Brink was scheduling a joint meeting between the Citizens Utility Advisory Board (CUAB), Traffic Safety and Transportation Board (TSTB), and Budget Committee on this issue.
5. **Councilor Lancaster** discussed cable negotiations and fees.

The work session ended at 9:10 p.m.

Pat DuVal, Recorder